

# **Welcome Center Data Collection Process Improvement**

Devon M. Harris  
South Carolina Department of Parks, Recreation & Tourism  
January 29, 2014

## Problem Statement

Currently, the staffs of the state's nine welcome centers directly assist an average of 1.4 million visitors each year. We track this information because we collect data by requesting visitors to sign a guest register. This register is a simple form asking visitors for their origin, destination, the number in their party, and if it is their first time to South Carolina.<sup>1</sup>

The form has 42 lines per sheet with 21 lines per side. The staff of the center tallies each column (or category) per sheet. The sheet totals are entered onto another page that lists 121 potential visitor origins for a daily total and they also enter the total of no's for first timers. Some centers have begun to use the computerized version of this form in order to save time.<sup>2</sup> This causes a fork in the process map but it rejoins and the end result is the same. All totaled information for one day is entered into an electronic database.

The database only allows one entry for the day, blocking the ability to go directly from the register to the database. Therefore, the middle step is necessary to get a daily tally per origin option (e.g., 15 sheets have 10 NC guests, which tallies to a daily total of 150 NC guests). This step also ensures accuracy and prevents human mathematical errors. Centers will have 5-35 pages per day, depending on the season and center location.

Visitor destinations are further categorized into 17 smaller locations and placed into an Excel Workbook<sup>3</sup>. The destination data collection was added in Spring 2012 and since that time the SCPRT Technology Services Department has had other project priorities and not enough resources to add this tracking component to our database. It will continue to be tracked in Excel until it is added into the database.

---

<sup>1</sup> Appendix A- Register Sheet

<sup>2</sup> Appendix B- Visitor Origin Log

<sup>3</sup> Appendix C- Visitor Destinations Log

While completing the process mapping exercise for the existing process, I found it to be an efficient and effective paper based process. However, since it is a paper-based system, it has waste and using the process improvement curriculum, I was able to identify waste in the areas of motion, over processing, overproduction and, occasionally, defects. One improvement some centers can make is to move toward using the computer version of the tally sheet as a few centers have already done. I believe, ultimately, computerizing this step will cut time spent in that specific step of the process once the staff member acclimates to the change. It also alleviates the issue of variation/forking in the process among the centers and additional paper printing costs and storage space.

The end product of the visitor data collection process is valuable because it gives us the profile information about visitors traveling to and through the state. It is one of two metrics we use to gauge the overall traffic through the centers when reporting to the agency and state on the program's usefulness and effectiveness. It's also used in determining marketing efforts for both the agency and its industry partners. However, the agency and tourism partners also have access to other research conducted by national organizations and other data collected by SCPRT, therefore, the Welcome Center's data collection is supplemental and a secondary objective, albeit an important one, for our program.

SCPRT's mission is economic development through sustainable tourism development, marketing and promotion to increase visitation and improve the quality of life for residents of the state. Within that mission, the Welcome Center Program is the front-line marketing team. We exist to increase travel expenditures and expand economic development within the state's tourism industry. We do this by serving as the "front porch" to South Carolina- welcoming them with our award winning customer service, providing them with "inside" information, stories and experiences, and enticing them to make that extra stop, spend more money and stay longer.

An inordinate amount of manpower is spent organizing, counting, verifying and recording the visitor data. This is not the best use of human or financial resources for a secondary mission. If our nationally certified travel counselors are in the back counting sheets of yesterday's travelers, they aren't out front selling for today.

Because the process takes large amounts of time away from our primary purpose of front line sales and service, I began this project looking at the Four M's of Process Improvement: Material, Machines, Men and Methods as presented in the Certified Public Manager training curriculum. If one (or more) of these M's significantly changed, could the process, specifically in terms of the amount of time and resources spent on the process, be significantly improved?

#### Data Collection and Analysis

First, I established exactly what and how much of our resources go into the process. My primary data collection was the amount of time taken to organize, count, verify and record this information by staff.

On July 1, 2013 all staff members responsible for performing this task began tracking the time spent on this process. A column was added to one of the daily log sheets and when the "data processor" for the day signed off on the task, he/she also logged how long it took from beginning to end in minutes, along with their initials. The timing of July 1 through December 31 allowed for a range of visitation, including multiple seasons, peak weekends and slow traffic weeks. However, it should be noted the centers are open 361 days a year with four closed holidays. Three of the four scheduled annual days fell within this time period, affecting visitation numbers and these results slightly.

I obtained a current salary roster from the Human Resources Department and used the initials to match salaries to the recorded times. At the beginning of January 2014, I entered the data submitted by



the center managers and created a spreadsheet to determine how much money in staff resource/time is spent on visitor data collection and entry.

Appendix D shows a total of 1,982.6 hours were spent on this process in a six month period, rather than on the front line. A full time welcome center employee works 1,950 hours in one year so, projecting a similar pattern for the remainder of the year, this process is more than the equivalence of two FTEs.

When applying this time to the wages of the employees (broken down to an hourly wage) a total of \$26,083.99 of paid salary went into the process for a six month period. This is more than one Travel Coordinator I or II gets in a year. The average time spent per day on the process during the six month period is 9.22 hours (total hours/215 days) and the average hourly rate is \$13.67. Therefore, an estimated 27.7 hours and \$378.10 could be added to the totals to account for the three closed holidays.

In addition to the salary associated with skill and time waste, the paper and ink for printing the register sheets are costly, even when bidding out for the lowest professional printer. Prior to 2012, the individual centers were responsible for printing register sheets at a shop or on site with their inkjet printers as needed.

From 2008 to 2012, the program spent about \$2,100 annually in printing register sheets. An exact figure was difficult to determine because the printing of the sheets is sometimes labeled as "supplies", a frequent entry in the budget tracking system. However, I sifted through documentation from the center managers and the previous Visitor Services Manager and found documentation to accompany the budgets for the past five years. This does not account for those instances where ink and paper were purchased for the centers that regularly printed on-site. When I joined the program in early 2012, I centralized the printing of the register sheets to create a more cost-effective process, with savings around \$2,200 every 24 months.

Once current costs were established, I looked at alternative options for the Machine, the last “M” I needed to address. To do this, I researched how other visitor centers capture their data. I found, essentially, two options- the paper method currently in use and electronic methods.

I researched similar high traffic tourism destinations within South Carolina including Hilton Head, Myrtle Beach, Charleston and Columbia and a few locations in our border states. I also used my access to a national listserv of welcome center program managers to inquire about other state-operated program data collection methods. Of those that responded, I learned of their mechanisms and got feedback about “going electronic”.

The comparable visitor center or museum type locations in South Carolina and our border states do not reach the amount of traffic we see system-wide. However, some are comparable at the center level. Of those, most had multi-purpose mechanisms such as a unit with a screen built into an exhibit. Some locations had stand-alone kiosks that both provides information (travel, exhibit, etc.) and asks questions to get email addresses or social media interest. I received many comments from the locations that said it is primarily children that play with the units. These locations and their tracking methods did not compare to the needs of the Welcome Centers.

From the listserv query I learned that South Carolina is like many states- tracking by paper but looking at taking the leap to electronic. Of the fifteen respondents, nine said they are looking at electronic methods and want to know what others are doing. Two shared their experiences with electronic registers and the companies they used. Four respondents simply stated they use a paper registry. Some of the responses included valid comments about the user of Welcome Centers, their “traditional nature” and the inability of electronic books to “flip through” and see what other visitors have come from the same state. One other response included comments about sanitation and touching a screen that many people have touched. A few of

those exploring electronic methods said they would still keep a paper register on the counter in addition to the new electronic method.

From this research, I determined an electronic method would need to:

1. Capture the data we need and compile it on a daily basis, or weekly at maximum. Ideally, a system would compile a full day of information and calculations on a daily basis.  
However, a weekly compilation would be acceptable because we can choose the day we enter the information based on the busyness of center traffic.
2. Allow flexibility and control in what the agency wants to capture. Occasionally we may ask for additional information or change the questions for marketing purposes. We want flexibility with, and control over, the survey questions.
3. Provide easy access to the daily/weekly data OR automatically connect with the agency database to upload the data. The new process is only an improvement if it is faster. Therefore, if it takes a long time to comb through data or to access it, the product may not be more efficient. Potentially, a new system could enter the data automatically into the database system, email the daily totals, or have a location where a staff member can log in to retrieve it within minutes.
4. Be low cost in order to allow purchase of a minimum of three per center for 27 units total. Each center has three paper registers and that is the minimum needed. This is based on traffic flow observed over time and space availability at the counters. If more are added, then the staff does not have adequate mapping space. If any are removed, then a line forms and people will not wait to sign the register resulting in lower counts.
5. Be low maintenance and easy to use on a center/staff level. Adding work to the managers and staff at the centers would not be a process improvement.



6. Be easy to use from the guest perspective. If it is difficult to read or in any way frustrating, slow, or otherwise annoying, visitors will walk away without completing it. This would not be a process improvement.
7. Have anti-theft security options available in the marketplace. People try to take paper guest registers. If our program purchases anything electronic it must have a way to be secured to the counter/ground if it is immobile or a person if it is portable.

To begin, I spoke with Technology Services (TS) for additional information. I was advised on the technical needs for the Welcome Centers, the database, and the upcoming technology plans for the agency. The primary concern with technology is a pending agency software and hardware roll-out in late Winter/early Spring 2014. If I choose a compatible system prior to the agency roll-out, a new technology contract could make my chosen system unusable. Based on this information, I was left with two options:

1. Wait to make a hard/software decision until the agency completes its rollout; or 2. Choose a hard/software that is independent from any existing network needs.

Next, I researched the availability of options in the marketplace and also the technical capabilities and needs from our Technology Services (TS) point-of-view. This research determined the top three electronic methods were kiosks, computer stations and tablets. A tablet style system with a web driven application was recommended by TS as most beneficial and compatible with our network and current systems. Additionally, I was advised about certain applications that would not have to be dependent upon the agency's networks and systems.

I spoke with three companies, Phoenix Kiosk, RiggsWard and CompuStation, regarding kiosks. Kiosks come in a wide range of options and are custom built. Most common are free-standing, ATM-like, units operated by touch screens using either web-based applications or software developed specifically by the kiosk design company. Table-top units exist but they



tend to be bulky like their floor model counterparts. One simpler option that would address the needs of the program is to place a computer and touch screen monitor into a casing unit. Kiosk prices typically range from \$4,000 to \$10,000 for the entire unit plus software.

A benefit to kiosks is they are often capable of much more than a brief survey asking for demographics. Many companies have software that can be expanded to include travel and routing information. SCPRT previously partnered with the Charleston Area Convention and Visitors Bureau and City Corridor, a kiosk development company, and housed a travel kiosk in the Santee Welcome Center for six months. It did not, however, replace the paper register and capture guest data during those months. In this case, the units were meant to be temporary for testing purposes and then were removed. Kiosks, as a whole are fill a lot of space. Our centers are limited in space and three kiosks to gather sign-in data is not feasible.

Computer stations are a better option for space but can still be bulky. In researching online sources New Egg, Best Buy and PC Mag, I found all-in-one desktop computers with touch screens would save the most space. The monitor and desktop hard drive are combined into one unit so the need for three full sized computers would not be necessary. Prices range from \$800 to \$2,000 for the hardware and pre-loaded Windows Suite software. Security of the all-in-one is a concern so a locking mechanism for approximately \$40 is necessary.

A factor in choosing computers with full operating systems is maintenance and service by Technology Services. If the Welcome Center Program pursues this path, all timing, equipment choices, purchasing, roll-out, etc. would be at the discretion of the agency and TS. With the upcoming agency technology roll-out, list of agency priority projects and limited staffing availability, this process improvement would be outside of my control or influence and could be

delayed for an undetermined amount of time. Significant delays will mean continued waste of resources.

Tablets were recommended by TS as the top option. Using the same online sources as with the computer station research, I found tablets in the \$200-\$500 range that would support the needs previously outlined. Specifically, the Google Nexus and Kindle Fire were TS recommended brands and the price points for those are about \$230. The tablets would have to be secure and either carried by a staff person or displayed on the counter. Since full staffing can be difficult at times, counter top display is preferable. A lockable display mounting unit attachable to the counter is approximately \$80. For one full hardware unit, the total cost is around \$310.

With this option I explored a variety of software options including mobile applications and web-based applications. Through testing and inquiries with companies, I found QuestionPro and Opiniator to be the paid options that fit most appropriately, each offering annual fees ranging from \$180 to \$2,000 depending on which service contract was chosen.

In my discussions with TS, Google Drive was mentioned and after researching the capabilities I found it was the most usable alternative for our purposes that is also free of charge. There are similar options and I found a website that compares them.<sup>4</sup>

Using Google Drive, I created a survey and a connecting spreadsheet to test<sup>5</sup>. I entered fake data and watched it capture and organize it in real time. If the Welcome Centers were to use this process, it would take only a few minutes to sign in to their individual Google Drive accounts each day, pull down the numbers and enter them into the database. Estimating it would take ten minutes a day, 60 hours total for a year on the new process, it is still, 3, 905 hours less than the current process.

---

<sup>4</sup> Appendix E- Survey Tools Comparison Chart

<sup>5</sup> Appendix F-Google Drive Test

Additionally, the program is Microsoft Excel based so the data that is downloaded in real time can be manipulated in real time or be saved and used as needed. With all of the information entered electronically, we would have capabilities to cross reference and use data in all new ways. For instance, if an industry partner wants to know what neighboring states generate the most visitors to their region, we would be able to provide that data using simple Excel compilation and sort features and assist them in making informed marketing decisions.

This solution is not a perfect one because it does not input the data automatically into the database. To use an option with that kind of capability would be much more expensive financially and with intra-agency personnel. However, this option is a much improved process that can be quickly and easily implemented.

#### Implementation Plan

I would begin with a test site. This can be done cheaply and easily to refine the process prior to taking it system-wide. If the Welcome Centers were to use the tablets and Google Drive process, each center would need to set up its own spreadsheet because of table space limitations.<sup>6</sup> This can be done centrally once more information is gathered from the test.

After the time tracking began and the staff and managers saw how much time is spent on this process, an “aha” moment occurred and buy-in was secured at the centers. Buy-in from the chain of command and Technology Services are essential. To begin getting this buy-in, I will submit a brief proposal containing the back-up data, objectives, needs, actions indicating the responsible party, and a timeline. Buy-in is often determined by the priorities set forth. Sometimes, however, it is about the ability or inability to fix the problem. A strong proposal

---

<sup>6</sup> Space limitations of Excel would require a spreadsheet be saved when it is full. This will take about 12 mos. at the busiest centers or 18- 24 mos. at the slower traffic centers. Once saved it can be cleared of data and started again.



would demonstrate this project has an easy solution with a large impact. It can be a big “win” if it is made a priority for my program.

Once buy-in is achieved, I would work with Finance and my supervisor to verify cost allowances (capital improvement) for purchase of the tablets and mounts for the test center. Once the approval to move forward is given, I would work with Finance to procure the items. Simultaneously, I would notify the managers that the new process is to be tested and we would identify the test location based on rotation, staffing status, time of year and other center related factors. I would also notify the SC Department of Transportation at this time. As owners of the building, we notify them when we make any major changes and this will require their maintenance staff to secure the mounts to the counter when the time comes.

Next, I would introduce the manager to the Google Drive, begin the training process and communicate often with him/her regarding the change. I would visit the center to give a preview to the staff of the functionality, get feedback and make adjustments as needed. During this time of development, communication, feedback and repeated training are needed.

When the equipment has arrived and it is installed, I would be on site to assist with kinks or issues. The manager and staff would test for a minimum of six weeks to allow for evaluation and adjustments. During this time, the staff would log the process time as they did for this project’s data collection so they can be compared. Essentially, we would follow the Plan-Do-Check-Act (PDCA) cycle until the new process is working well. If it is found to be ineffective during the test period, it will not be distributed system-wide until it is either resolved or a new process can be found and tested.

Once all is running smoothly and the project is ready to be implemented system-wide, the other centers will have their tablets installed. A full detailed process will be written and two



people from the test center will begin training the other center staffs, following our previous training protocols.

The cost for the tablets and mounts to pilot at one center is approximately \$930 plus travel to one center multiple times. A system-wide implementation cost is projected at \$8,400 plus an estimated \$1,000 in travel for training. I believe this can be accomplished in four to six months, from date of approval to fully operating at all centers.

#### Evaluation Method

During implementation, a constant evaluation will happen. The managers and I will monitor and communicate regularly, as well as log and assess the process time for the first few months. Asking for feedback directly from the staff and managers on a regular basis is crucial and it will be a regular topic of discussion on our monthly conference calls. Additionally, examining the captured data will be also valuable in determining change effectiveness to see if there are any noticeable discrepancies in sign-in percentages or traffic pattern changes.

Evaluation of this and other processes will continue because process improvement is never-ending.

#### Recommendations

It is my recommendation to purchase tablets and lockable display mount units to digitalize the guest registry process for the South Carolina Welcome Centers. Going electronic with this process will significantly cut the amount of staff time and resources spent on data collection, thereby increasing customer service and sales on the front line.

[illegible]

VISITOR ORIGIN  
DOMESTIC DAILY LOG  
DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

[illegible]

VISITOR ORIGIN  
DOMESTIC DAILY LOG  
DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

[illegible]



Visitor Origin  
International Daily Log  
DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

[illegible]

Visitor Origin  
International Daily Log  
DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

[illegible]

	AA	AB	AC	AD	AE	AF	AG	AH	AI	AJ	SC Undefined	SC Resident	FL	GA	NC	Unknown	Other	Total
Little River	7384	833	59	9	21	28	0	4	7	28	182	325	174	94	1164	444	213	10969
Blacksburg	45	34	8	0	2	22	0	54	9	1442	591	963	543	5226	355	284	1590	11168
Landrum	3915	2094	1089	103	63	465	42	44	56	663	181	1948	943	663	502	128	307	13206
Fair Play	324	208	27	12	9	84	0	111	144	2757	559	870	44	316	6097	125	3357	15044
North Augusta	1872	1120	973	127	87	312	48	49	157	127	517	948	237	219	288	218	189	7488
Hamer	2572	1627	909	148	148	549	74	21	5	89	382	632	5123	1296	249	284	665	14773
Santee	57	1325	896	123	21	8	8	0	7	18	329	746	6083	1080	73	235	227	11236
Hardeeville	1024	1889	1755	153	147	346	61	5	151	328	1023	499	631	141	3416	325	8438	20332
Fort Mill	411	710	678	62	30	439	48	29	316	39	452	762	2115	552	146	35	125	6949
Total	17604	9840	6394	737	528	2253	281	317	852	5491	4216	7693	15893	9587	12290	2078	15111	111165

	AA	AB	AC	AD	AE	AF	AG	AH	AI	AJ	SC Undefined	SC Resident	FL	GA	NC	Unknown	Other	Total
Little River	6709	718	59	8	30	42	4	2	11	9	177	158	196	123	989	329	183	9747
Blacksburg	42	45	5	0	3	13	4	70	15	1513	469	796	429	4004	367	292	1386	9453
Landrum	2207	1317	789	76	36	432	57	67	64	428	181	1747	910	398	481	89	226	9505
Fair Play	140	170	30	24	9	73	2	100	105	2452	557	834	20	279	4206	131	2666	11798
North Augusta	1105	693	98	99	46	355	129	13	50	43	162	425	14	155	555	34	257	4233
Hamer	2467	1267	800	152	153	382	37	22	5	80	586	546	3867	1008	160	25	634	12191
Santee	54	1094	1225	130	4	34	17	2	2	12	222	942	5936	801	96	82	188	10841
Hardeeville	927	1429	1285	159	167	257	22	5	67	305	720	538	579	163	2582	240	7640	17085
Fort Mill	446	587	580	54	49	458	44	25	290	39	358	676	1898	456	136	43	96	6235
Total	14097	7320	4871	702	497	2046	316	306	609	4881	3432	6662	13849	7387	9572	1265	13276	91088



	AA	AB	AC	AD	AE	AF	AG	AH	AI	AJ	SC Undefined	SC Resident	FL	GA	NC	Unknown	Other	Total
Little River	4739	820	93	12	23	18	13	2	12	19	123	144	219	90	601	309	177	7414
Blacksburg	23	34	4	0	0	6	4	57	19	1273	359	743	321	2753	260	198	967	7021
Landrum	2490	1235	716	50	35	348	34	32	76	418	156	1604	675	447	360	96	308	9080
Fair Play	199	169	21	12	7	76	7	65	109	1656	536	494	30	238	3778	130	2402	9929
North Augusta	1291	987	55	82	68	363	136	19	67	8	172	563	16	67	692	108	472	5166
Hamer	987	1151	901	69	128	199	30	22	10	81	393	428	2575	785	138	91	559	8547
Santee	55	711	1063	226	28	9	6	1	0	8	270	630	3493	850	41	31	85	7507
Hardeeville	808	1595	1667	122	99	279	41	7	67	137	663	601	303	126	2412	254	5371	14552
Fort Mill	68	502	563	51	11	343	49	16	263	32	342	544	1746	384	126	81	88	5209
Total	10660	7204	5083	624	399	1641	320	221	623	3632	3014	5751	9378	5740	8408	1298	10429	74425

	AA	AB	AC	AD	AE	AF	AG	AH	AI	AJ	SC Undefined	SC Resident	FL	GA	NC	Unknown	Other	Total
Little River	4262	900	80	21	4	28	2		7	23	141	173	322	110	392	367	215	7047
Blacksburg	31	26	3	1	0	17	2	67	13	1405	436	712	450	3472	414	226	1330	8605
Landrum	2241	1715	904	82	39	423	66	65	81	551	183	2582	1261	618	478	121	429	11839
Fair Play	180	141	23	13	8	98	4	83	105	2495	301	682	40	387	5281	84	2390	12315
North Augusta	1053	1052	85	73	46	393	169	17	58	35	219	630	6	133	633	115	320	5037
Hamer	1539	1135	746	119	183	248	53	8	8	104	935	432	4208	697	138	77	523	11153
Santee	51	965	839	172	3	11	15	2	4	11	164	1056	5331	888	53	22	183	9770
Hardeeville	891	1976	1760	111	150	378	46	17	93	276	655	1089	516	250	2987	302	5335	16832
Fort Mill	342	579	476	62	14	373	46	7	272	22	334	549	3106	430	126	72	120	6930
Total	10590	8489	4916	654	447	1969	403	266	641	4922	3368	7905	15240	6985	10502	1386	10845	89528

	AA	AB	AC	AD	AE	AF	AG	AH	AI	AJ	SC Undefined	SC Resident	FL	GA	NC	Unknown	Other	Total
Little River	3002	424	108	8	6	12	4	2	2	81	72	128	224	73	252	176	126	4700
Blacksburg	2	11	4	0	0	5	12	37	8	1018	324	615	277	2439	199	116	927	5994
Landrum	613	613	332	64	30	321	47	190	51	275	119	1136	744	317	276	87	186	5401
Fair Play	73	139	19	22	14	69	5	89	127	1866	237	410	25	217	3568	52	2112	9044
North Augusta	851	766	26	89	34	550	79	21	57	30	135	356	14	237	583	53	417	4298
Hamer	993	698	462	89	114	192	37	6	7	46	251	278	3950	473	205	0	306	8107
Santee	13	745	661	122	19	3	26	0	0	3	144	676	5959	672	63	61	100	993
Hardeeville	706	1335	1341	126	148	417	36	16	78	188	665	502	380	146	2706	219	5679	14688
Fort Mill	169	418	278	51	26	308	35	23	197	36	283	655	2441	365	117	63	91	5556
Total	6422	5149	3231	571	391	1877	281	384	527	3543	2230	4756	14014	4939	7969	827	9944	67055



	AA	AB	AC	AD	AE	AF	AG	AH	AI	AJ	SC Undefined	SC Resident	FL	GA	NC	Unknown	Other	Total
Little River	2590	485	39	6	6	8	0	0	0	4	89	89	149	50	181	132	70	3898
Blacksburg	4	9	2	2	0	17	1	23	6	782	183	581	399	2446	184	202	1053	5894
Landrum	449	509	294	54	47	182	36	15	40	293	125	922	772	302	265	60	120	4485
Fair Play	68	104	11	8	6	55	4	30	106	1255	220	405	28	211	3050	84	1827	7472
North Augusta	918	865	30	91	39	294	133	7	59	11	215	409	19	86	744	47	326	4293
Hamer	588	636	384	40	76	164	26	0	2	20	243	375	5019	645	145	19	371	8753
Santee	12	822	450	123	6	4	2	0	7	0	264	758	7887	724	47	35	179	11320
Hardeeville	515	1022	751	112	127	187	10	4	45	123	530	688	335	106	2811	224	5933	13523
Fort Mill	171	300	222	41	15	290	46	9	236	5	301	512	2928	401	105	58	80	5720
Total	5315	4752	2183	477	322	1201	258	88	501	2493	2170	4739	17536	4971	7532	861	9959	65358

**Guest Data Collection Process  
Time and Salary Spreadsheet**

Employee Personnel Number	Hours per Week	Pay Band	Annual Salary	Pay Per Hour	In Minutes						Total in minutes	Total in Hours	Total 6 Month Cost in Personnel Time
					July	Aug.	Sept.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.			
E37	TEMP	NR00	\$9/HR	\$9.00	337	369	372	311	80	135	1,604	26.73	\$240.60
E1	37.5	BAND 03	\$27,933.00	\$14.32	1,302	1,305	519	384	231	736	4,477	74.62	\$1,068.86
E2	37.5	BAND 03	\$27,279.00	\$13.99	455	660	195	1,290	675	1,065	4,340	72.33	\$1,011.89
E3	37.5	BAND 05	\$37,568.00	\$19.27	602	391	145	511	505	0	2,154	35.90	\$691.64
E4	37.5	BAND 03	\$26,331.00	\$13.50	875	920	1,080	1,025	1,135	1,200	6,235	103.92	\$1,403.19
E5	37.5	BAND 03	\$25,998.00	\$13.33	735	705	690	1,170	630	960	4,890	81.50	\$1,086.58
E6	37.5	BAND 03	\$25,415.00	\$13.03	91	547	265	354	224	0	1,481	24.68	\$321.71
E7	37.5	BAND 05	\$37,942.00	\$19.46	478	286	321	485	249	387	2,206	36.77	\$715.39
E38	TEMP	NR00	\$9/HR	\$9.00	13		10	37	89		149	2.48	\$22.35
E8	37.5	BAND 05	\$37,568.00	\$19.27	460						460	7.67	\$147.70
E9	37.5	BAND 03	\$23,051.00	\$11.82	278	299		42	40	76	735	12.25	\$144.81
E10	37.5	BAND 03	\$25,795.00	\$13.23	1,266	1,236	1,511	1,428	1,025	643	7,109	118.48	\$1,567.32
E39	TEMP	NR00	\$9/HR	\$9.00	144	234	148	288	245	15	1,074	17.90	\$161.10
E11	37.5	BAND 05	\$43,167.00	\$22.14	40	40					80	1.33	\$29.52
E40	TEMP	NR00	\$9/HR	\$9.00					331		331	5.52	\$49.65
E41	TEMP	NR00	\$9/HR	\$9.00	50	290	230	216	379		1,165	19.42	\$174.75
E12	37.5	BAND 05	\$37,568.00	\$19.27	196	328	235	252	232	235	1,478	24.63	\$474.58
E13	37.5	BAND 03	\$23,051.00	\$11.82	547	274	115	688	557	446	2,627	43.78	\$517.56
E14	37.5	BAND 03	\$23,051.00	\$11.82	710	795	315	930	1,300	915	4,965	82.75	\$978.19
E15	37.5	BAND 03	\$23,051.00	\$11.82	343	554	437	596	0	68	1,998	33.30	\$393.64
E16	37.5	BAND 06	\$54,075.00	\$27.73	65		92	145			302	5.03	\$139.58
E17	37.5	BAND 03	\$23,051.00	\$11.82	548	673	619	130			1,970	32.83	\$388.12
E18	37.5	BAND 03	\$26,623.00	\$13.65	287	81	264	112	261	264	1,269	21.15	\$288.76
E19	37.5	BAND 05	\$37,568.00	\$19.27			210	120		60	390	6.50	\$125.23
E20	37.5	BAND 05	\$37,568.00	\$19.27		510	534	105	390	500	2,039	33.98	\$654.71
E21	37.5	BAND 05	\$37,568.00	\$19.27	330	516	246	340	279		1,711	28.52	\$549.39
E22	37.5	BAND 03	\$27,942.00	\$14.33	910	990	650	535	790	500	4,375	72.92	\$1,044.84
E46	TEMP	NR00	\$9/HR	\$9.00	284						284	4.73	\$42.60
E42	TEMP	NR00	\$9/HR	\$9.00			68				68	1.13	\$10.20
E23	37.5	BAND 03	\$23,051.00	\$11.82	757	745	858	915	519	858	4,652	77.53	\$916.52
E24	37.5	BAND 03	\$23,051.00	\$11.82	2,175	180	705	459	1,041	836	5,396	89.93	\$1,063.10
E43	TEMP	NR00	\$9/HR	\$9.00				1	165	13	179	2.98	\$26.85

**Guest Data Collection Process  
Time and Salary Spreadsheet**

Employee Personnel Number	Hours per Week	Pay Band	Annual Salary	Pay Per Hour	July	Aug.	Sept.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	Total in minutes	Total in Hours	Total 6 Month Cost in Personnel Time
E25	37.5	BAND 03	\$23,051.00	\$11.82	364	364	352	206	252	164	1,702	28.37	\$335.32
E26	37.5	BAND 03	\$25,415.00	\$13.03	660	406	519	638	493		2,716	45.27	\$589.98
E27	37.5	BAND 03	\$25,795.00	\$13.23	435	299	474	215			1,423	23.72	\$313.73
E28	37.5	BAND 03	\$25,795.00	\$13.23	747	780	805	927	720	720	4,699	78.32	\$1,035.99
E47	TEMP	NR00	\$9/HR	\$9.00	360	180	270	630	300	315	2,055	34.25	\$308.25
E29	37.5	BAND 03	\$25,051.00	\$12.85	719	528	637	612	380	380	3,256	54.27	\$697.15
E30	37.5	BAND 03	\$23,051.00	\$11.82	488	496	241	404			1,629	27.15	\$320.94
E31	37.5	BAND 03	\$26,243.00	\$13.46	678	346	68	52	262	0	1,406	23.43	\$315.36
E32	37.5	BAND 03	\$23,051.00	\$11.82	1,015	855	870	1,260	465	605	5,070	84.50	\$998.88
E44	TEMP	NR00	\$9/HR	\$9.00	365	465	375	690	530	225	2,650	44.17	\$397.50
E33	37.5	BAND 03	\$23,051.00	\$11.82	826	851	579	794	885	579	4,514	75.23	\$889.34
E34	37.5	BAND 03	\$25,415.00	\$13.03	654	503	142	368	204	204	2,075	34.58	\$450.74
E35	37.5	BAND 03	\$25,795.00	\$13.23	3,174	3,528	2,499	1,520	576	836	12,133	202.22	\$2,674.96
E36	37.5	BAND 03	\$25,945.00	\$13.31	364	343	170	42	40	291	1,250	20.83	\$277.19
E45	TEMP	NR00	\$9/HR	\$9.00	13		10	35	127		185	3.08	\$27.75
TOTALS:					25,140	22,872	18,845	21,262	16,606	14,231	118,956	1,982.60	\$26,083.99



Whinot Blog  
<http://whinot.com/blog>  
 January 31, 2012  
 Tiffany Henderson

#### 4 Online Survey Tools: Which One is Best for You?

whinot

##### COMPARISON OF FREE SURVEY TOOLS

	 SurveyMonkey	 Zoomerang	 Google Forms	 surveygizmo
Unlimited # of Surveys	✓	✗	✓	✓
Response Limits	100/survey	100/survey	200,000	1,000/month
Question Limits / Survey	10	12	255	Unlimited
Customize Brand Image	✗	✗	✓	✗
Customize Colors & Fonts	✓	✓	✓	✓
Export to PDF/ Word Doc	✗	✗	✓	✓
Embed Survey into Webpage	✓	✓	✓	✓
Randomizing and Skip Logic	Randomize (answers only)	Randomize (answers only)	✓	Randomize (answers only)
Survey Templates	✓	✓	✓	✓
Real Time Reporting	✓	✓	✓	✓
# of Question Types	15	15	6	23
Supports all Languages	✓	✓	✓	✓
Embed Images & Media	✓	✓	✓	✓
Upload Images	✓	✓	✓	✗
Support via e-mail & FAQ Tutorials	✓	✓	✓	✓
Send E-mail Using Survey Tool	✓	✓	✓	✓
Facebook Integration	✗	✓	✓	✓
Twitter Integration	✗	✓	✓	✓

Appendix E Sample of captured data from test and sample form created.

ALABAMA		ARKANSAS		Grand Total	
SUM of Where are you from?		SUM of How many people are traveling with you today?	SUM of How many people are traveling with you today?	SUM of Where are you from?	SUM of How many people are traveling with you today?
Total					
ALABAMA	2	0	2	0	2
	25	0	25	0	25
ALABAMA Total		0	27	0	27
ARKANSAS	5		0	5	5
ARKANSAS Total			0	5	5
Grand Total		0	27	0	32


My Drive - Google Drive x Untitled form - Google Drive x Welcome to South Carolina! x

AV\_Q0\_XUliqylzih8Tv1tE3zF\_uLk3xRTN0hU\_RIc/viewform

Web Slice Gallery Enterprise Database Citrix Access Gateway Vendor Search MySCEmploy SRM

**Welcome to South Carolina!**

\* Required

**South Carolina**  
Just right. 

Where are you from? \*

What is your destination? \*

☐ South Carolina  
☐ North Carolina  
☐ Georgia  
☐ Florida  
☐ Other

☐ Other:

How many people are traveling with you today? \*

Is this your first time to South Carolina? \*

☐ Yes  
☐ No

How would you rate the quality of customer service you received in the visitor center today?

W e G L P